I. Call to Order
Ms. Jones called the meeting to order at 6:10 pm. Those present were:

Ms. Donna Jones
Ms. Jean McHatton
Mr. Saul Romero
Ms. Val Moeller
Ms. Mary Villegas

Mr. Andy Harrod and Ms. Kimberly Rangell were absent. Others present were Dr. Noelia Vela, Ms. Jo Ann Higdon, Ms. Lola Rizkallah, and Ms. Deborah Shepley.

II. Welcome
Ms. Jones welcomed each of the committee members.

III. Public Comments
No public comments.

IV. Approval of Minutes of June 21, 2005 Meeting
It was moved by Ms. McHatton and seconded by Ms. Villegas that the minutes of June 21, 2005 be approved as presented. The motion passed. The committee expressed interest in having future minutes sent electronically. Dr. Vela concurred and indicated she would ensure that future minutes would be sent electronically to all committee members.

V. Campus Transformation Implementation Plan
Dr. Vela introduced Ms. Deborah Shepley from tBP/Architecture. She noted that Ms. Shepley is a principal at tBP/Architecture and that this architectural firm was board approved on October 31, 2005 as the Campus Master Plan Architect.

Ms. Shepley presented a power-point presentation and outlined the following Implementation Planning Steps:

- Define all project scopes – including both the primary projects and the secondary projects.
- Develop realistic project budgets.
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• Review logistics and prepare a master project schedule.
• Coordinate all capital planning efforts – look closely and strategically at the state funding that is available and coordinate it in order to maximize the GO Bond funds.

Ms. Shepley stated that since Cerritos College has passed its GO Bond, construction costs have risen dramatically. These rising construction costs would have an impact on GO Bond dollars available for the scheduled campus construction projects.

Ms. Shepley reviewed the Scope and Budget process which includes:

• Assembling the team
  ○ Architects, Engineers, College staff and a Cost Estimator.
  ○ Site and Building walks which provided a review of:
    ▪ Shifts of function (who is moving where)
    ▪ General Code issues (regarding accessibility, exiting for fire and life safety, etc.)
    ▪ General condition both on the site and in the buildings (maintenance issues.)

• Developing preliminary scopes of work
  ○ Renovations
  ○ New construction projects based on what has been programmed initially for new buildings.
  ○ Site projects – scopes for a variety of site projects and campus-wide improvements.

• Developing Rough Order of Magnitude (ROM) budgets
  ○ Important to note that these ROM budgets are budgets, not estimates. They are budgets from which the architects can plan. It is not an estimate yet because it is based only on the preliminary information known at this point.
  ○ A cost estimator prepared the ROM Budgets.
  ○ Initial refinement based on experience.
  ○ Draft #1 of ROM budgets will be further refined.

• Budget Assumptions
  ○ Total Project Costs (hard and soft costs.)
  ○ Contingencies
  ○ Escalation factors

Ms. Shepley provided a summary of the Rough Order of Magnitude (ROM) budgets. This summary was divided into 4 categories (building renovations, new construction, site projects, and campus-wide projects) and provided budget information such as if any state funds were identified and the estimated amount of bond funds needed to complete a project.
Ms. Shepley noted that once the ROM budgets were totaled the next step was to look at scheduling. Scheduling and the ability to do a number of things on campus at once would drive how some of the implementation decisions are made.

**Scope and Budget Process**

- Developed preliminary schedules
- Factors considered are:
  - Logical sequencing of functions.
  - Need for swing space.
  - Amount of disruption on campus.
  - Reasonable amount of construction at one time in terms of not only limiting disruption, but also allowing the appropriate level of supervision.
  - Being aware of state funding timelines and placing those projects in timelines that correspond with the state funding cycles.

Ms. Shepley presented the implementation schedule. This implementation schedule provided an overview of the construction projects and the phases projects would go through until completion of the campus’ transformation.

The following are questions, comments from committee:

Ms. Jones inquired if the campus was currently built to capacity according to state standards or was there room for growth. Ms. Shepley replied that according to the state, there is a little excess space in the inventory. Currently, the District cannot compete for more space, but could compete in other areas and are currently pursuing those avenues. Dr. Vela added that Cerritos College, along with many other California community colleges experienced a decrease in enrollment for a variety of reasons. It is important that the campus build within state guidelines.

Ms. Jones inquired if the District was preparing for construction cost increases. Dr. Vela replied that the District is forecasting and including contingencies as much as possible with the information known at this time.

Ms. Jones inquired if Southland Motor Car Dealers Association were going to assist in the funding of the automotive technology complex. Dr. Vela noted that Southland Motor Car Dealers Association would be involved in raising $3 million in funds and that the complex would be named Southland Cerritos Center for Transportation Technologies. The District has identified the area in which this building would be located, along with the amount of square footage the Southland Motor Car Dealers Association needs and the amount of square footage the District is eligible to expand to meet state standards.
Dr. Vela informed the committee that the District has chosen not to build a parking structure. A parking structure is costly to build, and it is more cost effective and efficient to use some of the District's land for surface parking and still be able to increase the amount of parking that the District currently has.

Ms. Shepley noted that in order to complete all the requested construction projects, with the current funds available, it appears that the District would need to pursue a second GO Bond.

It was noted that campus-wide signage would be replaced and would be consistent throughout the campus. Also, major gateway signage would be located appropriately to emphasize the entries to the campus.

Additionally, it was noted that a new track would be installed in the stadium.

Ms. Shepley remarked that all the information presented was based on the information known to the District to date. District needs will be reviewed annually based on the information known, and based on known available resources and campus variables.

Dr. Vela indicated that each user group of a newly constructed building would work closely with the architect to assist in the interior design of the building. This process encourages participation by user groups of the building. Also, each user group would be required to sign off of any changes to ensure each user is kept informed during the construction process.

The committee thanked Ms. Shepley for her presentation.

Dr. Vela explained that only two complaints had been received with regard to the board approved implementation plan. One complaint was from the automotive collision repair faculty. The automotive collision repair program has declined in enrollment, but the auto technology program has increased in enrollment. The District would like to provide the appropriate spaces to the appropriate program, so that the District could remain eligible for state funds. The auto collision repair faculty has complained to both her and the Board of Trustees. Dr. Vela shared that the District is committed to making decisions based upon facts and data, so at this point in time, the Board is supporting the current implementation plan. The other complaint was from the Physical Education department. A faculty member has expressed his desire to have the health and wellness complex moved up earlier on the construction calendar. Dr. Vela pointed out that the District already has devoted quite a bit of resources to the Physical Education department and the District wishes to be fair with the allotment of funds. Both she and the Campus Transformation Committee support the decision, and at this time, the health and wellness complex will not be placed any higher on the construction calendar.
VI. Campus Transformation Committee Update

Dr. Vela shared that by recommendation of the Board of Trustees, the GO Bond Implementation Committee name has been changed to the Campus Transformation Committee. The Board felt that the committee’s name should convey what the committee was about. The Campus Transformation Committee has been working hard and one of the outcomes of the committee was the implementation plan that was prepared jointly with the campus master plan architect. The implementation plan was presented to the Board at the October 19, 2005 study session, and then was presented to the campus via open forums. The implementation plan presented tonight was adopted by the Board October 31, 2005.

Ms. Higdon explained that currently the Campus Transformation Committee is working on a Request for Proposals (RFP) for a college advocate/owner’s representative (CA/OR). Ms. Higdon described the process by which the college decided to go out for a CA/OR. She noted that included in the RFP will be a no lobbying clause, which means that no firm that is applying can contact any member of our Board of Trustees, members of the Campus Transformation Committee, and tBP Architecture. She requested that the members of the Citizens’ Oversight Committee also be included on this list, and the committee concurred.

Dr. Vela shared that the landscape sub-committee is currently working on proposing campus landscape additions and changes to enhance the master plan.

Ms. Higdon provided a brief status report of other consultants working with the college. Below is a recap:

Infrastructure Master Plan
A draft of the final report is expected mid-December. The infrastructure consultant is working with the civil and landscaping consultants to review drainage issues on campus. It will be recommended that the campus upgrade the electrical infrastructure from a 4160 to a 12 KV power feed to support the technology for the next 50 years.

Civil Information
The civil consultant has been working on the site drainage issues. They are also challenged with the location of the fire hydrants. The consultant will be working with the campus to develop a fire lane plan to coordinate with the fire alarm, and hydrant plan for future development and code compliance. This plan will be negotiated with the LA County Fire Authority and local department for an overall campus approved plan.
ADA Compliance
The ADA consultant has been on site to begin their building assessments. Their plan is to provide reports for all facilities that are to remain on the campus.

Structural Seismic Report
The structural engineer is almost completed with the seismic report on the buildings to remain.

Architectural Master Plan
The board gave direction that tBP/Architecture would be serving as the campus master plan architect. tBP is compiling the recommendations for the Design Guidelines and Campus Standards.

VII. Audit Report
A representative from Vicenti, Lloyd and Stutzman provided a brief recap of the two audit reports, financial and performance. She noted that both audit reports were in draft format, as Vicenti, Lloyd and Stutzman are currently finalizing the district audit. It was anticipated that the only changes to these audit reports would be cosmetic changes.

Financial Audit: The financial audit showed that Vicenti, Lloyd and Stutzman reviewed the district financial statements related to only the bond construction fund. According to the independent auditor’s report, they have given the District a clean opinion. There were no findings related to the financial audit of the bond fund. This reflects very highly of the Cerritos College management and accounting department.

Performance Audit: The independent auditors report was a clean opinion with no findings.

Ms. Jones made a motion to accept and file the audit reports. Ms. McHatton seconded the motion. Motion unanimously approved.

VIII. Expiration of Committee Member Terms
At the first Citizens’ Oversight Committee meeting of December 7, 2004 a drawing was held with regard to committee members terms of office. There were three committee members who had one year terms and the balance had two year terms.

One year terms: Andy Harrod, Jean McMatton, Mary Villegas.

Mr. Harrod, Ms. McHatton and Ms. Villegas all indicated they wished to continue one more year term.
IX. **Election of Vice Chair**
Ms. Villegas made a motion to re-appoint Ms. McHatton as vice-chair of the Citizens’ Oversight Committee. Ms. Moeller seconded. Motion unanimously approved.

X. **Nomination of Committee Member from Business Community**
Ms. Jones noted that the business owner member Mr. Alan Spitalnick is no longer available to serve on the committee, and the committee needs to nominate another member. A suggested nominee was Melanie Broad from Hallmark. A proposed deadline date to accept applications: January 31, 2006.

The committee concurred that any interested applicants could contact the President’s Office for applications. Once all interested applicants have completed the application for appointment, then Ms. Jones would contact the applicants. The committee agreed that Ms. Jones could make the final determination of the business representative committee member.

XI. **Report of Citizens’ Bond Oversight Committee Members**
Mr. Romero noted that ASCC President Paulo Amaral has not reported back any GO Bond information to the ASCC. Dr. Vela apologized not realizing that Mr. Amaral had not been keeping the ASCC updated. She offered that she and Ms. Shepley would be happy to provide a presentation to ASCC. Mr. Romero will contact Dr. Vela with a few dates for consideration.

The committee discussed a future meeting date and decided that April 25, 2006 would be the next committee meeting date.

Mr. Romero inquired if there is a plan for the District to pursue another GO Bond. Dr. Vela replied that she has taken every opportunity to inform the community that the District appreciates their support. According to the presentation just viewed, in order to complete all the identified projects, with the knowledge known today, the funds from the first GO Bond will not cover all those projects. Another bond measure would be needed in order to complete all identified projects. She indicated that it is important to be cognizant of what else is going on in the surrounding communities, what the economy looks like and what other measures would be on a future ballot. It would be beneficial to go for a second GO Bond before current funds are depleted, but after the District has demonstrated to our community some successes, and some completion of projects.

XII. **Other**
No other items were presented.

XIII. **Adjournment**
The meeting adjourned at 7:45 pm.
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